Oroville Facilities Relicensing Program
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Project No. 2100
Draft Summary of the Cultural Resources Work Group Meeting
June 21, 2005

The Department of Water Resources (DWR) hosted the Cultural Resources Work Group (CRWG) meeting on June 21, 2005 in Oroville.

A summary of the discussion, decisions made, and action items is provided below. This summary is not intended to be a transcript, analysis of the meeting, or to indicate agreement or disagreement with any of the items summarized, except where expressly stated. The intent is to present a summary for interested parties who could not attend the meeting. The following are attachments to this summary.

Attachment 1	Meeting Agenda
Attachment 2	Meeting Attendees
Attachment 3	Cultural Inventory for CA-BUT-362/H
Attachment 4	Obsidian and Basalt Source Map

Introduction
Attendees were welcomed to the CRWG meeting and objectives were discussed. The meeting agenda and a list of meeting attendees and their affiliations are appended to this summary as Attachments 1 and 2, respectively.

Update on Studies
Mark Selverston of Sonoma State University gave an update on the historic sites evaluation and presented a slide show documenting the fieldwork undertaken to evaluate historic resources within the project area. He reminded the group that 803 resources, 553 with a historic element, were found during the inventory. He said that the resources are being evaluated for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) as part of a 'district' under NRHP guidelines. All 553 historic-era resources identified are being considered as possible elements of that district in the project area. He added that certain resources could also be significant on their own merits – aside from being identified as a part of the historic district designation. Mark explained how the evaluation sampled 52 resources, a sub-set of the 553 total, to better understand the components of the district.

Mark reminded the CRWG that the site-specific studies began in the fall of 2003 and continued until the spring of 2005. Since March 2005, work has focused on the site-specific analysis of the sampled resources. He noted that many of the sites are within the fluctuation zone and he explained how the field schedule was designed to extend across two seasons in the hopes that inundated sites would become available for study. More recently, they have focused on trying to use samples to help define property types, as well as establishing historic contexts and periods of significance. Mark added that an additional 71 new sites were discovered while conducting this phase of the study. One participant asked Mark if he had encountered references to Beckworth during his studies. Mark responded that he had only seen Beckworth mentioned in reference to the trail.

Mark informed the CRWG that the working name for the district is the Forks of the Feather River Historic District. Three themes broadly define the historic timeline: Gold Mining; Settlement; and Extractive Industry. Within those themes, Mark described the 'context' of these themes to further refine activities taking place as follows:

Gold Mining:
- Placer
- Load
- Dredge mining

Settlement:
- Exploration
- Rural development
- Rural consolidation

Extractive Industry:
- Logging
- Lime
- Chromate
- Abietene (gray pine tree sap)

Mark told the CRWG that the researchers used the NRHP criteria to evaluate the 52 resources and they are finalizing summary evaluation statements. The preliminary assessment is that of the 52 resources evaluated, 32 resources appear to be individually eligible and as contributors to the district, 17 appear to be eligible as contributors to the district but are not individually eligible, and three (graded roads related to construction, large paths up the North Fork Feather River, and a stone dam at Oregon Creek) do not appear to be eligible.

Update on Evaluation Results for McCabe Creek Prehistoric Loci

Michael Delacorte, California State University, Sacramento provided an update and slide presentation on the McCabe Creek prehistoric studies. He reminded the CRWG that fieldwork was conducted last fall from November through December and a preliminary report is expected by the end of June. He distributed a handout, Cultural Inventory for CA-BUT-362/H by Locus, Collection Type, Unit and Description (Attachment 3), to the CRWG. Michael noted that the data indicate the various loci appear to have been inhabited at different times and for different lengths of time. He outlined the different kinds of field activities used to inventory and described resource types within each locus. Michael explained how water level fluctuation has affected some of these loci by removing much of the original sediment, although several loci appear to retain significant amounts of their original sediments. Three of the six loci tested appear to be eligible for NRHP listing.

Michael explained that obsidian hydration, a dating method that measures chemical changes in the surficial layer of obsidian, was used on samples collected at several loci and he reported that the hydration results indicate the loci were occupied at different times. He also described the use of volcanic chemical signature analysis to identify the source area for volcanic rocks such as obsidian and basalt. He distributed a map showing the locations of sources for the obsidian and basalt artifacts found at the project area (Attachment 4). Michael told the CRWG that the source results indicate people were traveling to these sources and also had extensive trade relations allowing them to take advantage of opportunities in areas at great distances from home. He said that almost all of the obsidian is from sources in northeastern California and northwestern Nevada although some obsidian from the Coast Ranges is also present. The closest obsidian source to the project area (the Tuscan source) is not represented in the specimens examined, likely because the material available there is of lesser quality. One participant asked what they might have traded

for obsidian. Michael responded that trade offers likely included food items, shells, charm stones, and hides.

Michael noted that a considerable amount of basalt was being used at the site, yet all of the 15 samples tested originated from sources located outside the region, and none were from the principal, extensive source of basalt in the Oroville area, the Lovejoy formation, which is also the cap rock of Table Mountain. Most of the samples were of Gold Lake basalt and may have arrived in the project area as river cobbles. Michael said he has started reanalyzing the BUT-84 non-NAGPRA artifacts and it appears that much of that material may be local Lovejoy basalt. However they were clearly not using much basalt from the Lovejoy formation at McCabe Creek. He indicated that they expect to see different types of toolstone used on different parts of the reservoir. Additional testing will be conducted on obsidian and basalt samples, as appropriate.

Update on the Historic Properties Management Plan

Janis Offermann of DWR explained to the CRWG that a preliminary draft Historic Properties Management Plan has been provided to reviewers and DWR is receiving comments. She noted that McCabe Creek would be used in the HPMP as an example of how cultural resources could be managed. The plan is to come up with some management alternative to include in the HPMP before submitting the document to FERC. Janis added that they plan to begin testing additional prehistoric sites this summer. Unfortunately, the reservoir level is not expected to drop below 850 feet this year, limiting the areas in which work can get done. She said that they are also considering testing sites at boat-in campgrounds.

Adrian Smith of the Kuksu Society distributed an informational notice for the book “Healing with Medicinal Plants of the West” (Abedus Press) and noted the book is available by mail order.

Next Meeting and Next Steps

The Facilitator announced that the next CRWG meeting is tentatively scheduled for September 14, 2005.

Action Items

None